

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 09-8121

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

MARCUS CRANDELL,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
Maryland, at Baltimore. Andre M. Davis, District Judge.
(1:07-cr-00414-AMD-1; 1:09-cv-01187-AMD)

Submitted: August 19, 2010

Decided: August 26, 2010

Before MOTZ, GREGORY, and AGEE, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Marcus Crandell, Appellant Pro Se. Albert David Copperthite,
Assistant United States Attorney, Baltimore, Maryland, for
Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Marcus Crandell seeks to appeal the district court's order denying his motion to withdraw the mandate and seeking reconsideration of its order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2010) motion. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2006). A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2006). When the district court denies relief on the merits, a prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims is debatable or wrong. Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); see Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003). When the district court denies relief on procedural grounds, the prisoner must demonstrate both that the dispositive procedural ruling is debatable, and that the motion states a debatable claim of the denial of a constitutional right. Slack, 529 U.S. at 484-85. We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Crandell has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We deny Crandell's motion to appoint counsel. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are

adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED